

necessitate transfer of the name *Ceratites* (*Ceratites*) *nodosus* to *Ceratites* (*Doloceratites*) *robustus* Riedel, 1916 is not germane. This is not an objective necessity but only a consequence of accepting the subjective synonymy proposed by Urlichs & Mundlos (1987).

Comments on the proposed conservation of the specific names of *Gebia major capensis* Krauss, 1843 and *G. africana* Ortmann, 1894 (currently *Upogebia capensis* and *U. africana*; Crustacea, Decapoda) by the designation of a replacement neotype for *U. capensis*

(Case 2827; BZN 49: 187–190)

(1) C.L. Griffiths

Marine Biology Research Institute, Zoology Department, University of Cape Town, Rondebosch 7700, South Africa

The species currently known by the names *Upogebia capensis* (Krauss, 1843) and *U. africana* (Ortmann, 1894) are amongst the better-known elements of the South African marine fauna and are extensively used by fishermen for bait. The names are thus well known not only in the specialist literature but also in general guide books and, indeed, in the laws governing seashore exploitation. It would therefore be very confusing if these names were unnecessarily changed. I therefore support the proposed replacement of the neotype for *U. capensis*, thus conserving the present usages.

(2) W. Emmerson

Department of Zoology, University of Transkei, Private Bag XI UNITRA, Umtata, Transkei, Southern Africa

I have recently read the application by Ngoc-Ho & Poore to conserve the specific names of *Upogebia capensis* (Krauss, 1843) and *U. africana* (Ortmann, 1894). Although I was aware of Sakai's (1982) name changes these do not appear to have been followed except in a catalogue by Holthuis (1991) who noted the unfortunate consequences. Certainly everyone here in South Africa still maintains the established usages. To avoid confusion I support the application and the proposed replacement neotype.

Editorial note. The comments below are from members of the Nomenclature Committee of The Crustacean Society.

(3) K. Baba

Kumamoto University Faculty of Education, 2-40-1 Kurokami, Kumamoto, 860 Japan

As has been explained by Ngoc-Ho & Poore in their application, Sakai's (1982) selection of the neotype for *Upogebia capensis* from material assigned to *U. africana* has caused a problem. The authors believe that *capensis* and *africana* are distinct species, separated from each other not only morphologically but also ecologically

and geographically. I agree with them and support the replacement of Sakai's neotype with the specimen they have selected.

(4) Thomas E. Bowman

Division of Crustacea, NHB-163, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC 20560, U.S.A.

I agree that Sakai's choice of a neotype for *Upogebia capensis* was ill-advised and upsets the usage of more than 40 years of that name and of *U. africana*. I recommend that the Commission approves the application by Ngoc-Ho & Poore.

(5) Joel W. Martin

Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County, 900 Exposition Boulevard, Los Angeles, California 90007, U.S.A.

The action proposed by Ngoc-Ho & Poore would remove current confusion resulting from what was obviously an unfortunate selection of a neotype by Sakai (1982). The species called *Upogebia capensis* (Krauss, 1843) and *U. africana* (Ortmann, 1894) are distinguishable morphologically and ecologically and it is clear that Sakai's choice of a neotype for *capensis* came from habitat suited for, and material previously identified as, *U. africana*. Further confusion resulted from Sakai's revival of *U. subspinosus* (Stimpson, 1860), for which no type exists and which was previously considered by Barnard (1947) as a synonym of *capensis*. The selection of a replacement neotype for *U. capensis* is clearly warranted and would clarify the taxonomic and ecological status of the two South African species of *Upogebia*. I therefore support the application.

(6) Austin B. Williams

National Marine Fisheries Service Systematics Laboratory, National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC 20560, U.S.A.

Evidence presented by Ngoc-Ho & Poore confirms the conclusions of the numerous authors cited by them that two species of *Upogebia* occur in South Africa, known as *U. capensis* (Krauss, 1843) and *U. africana* (Ortmann, 1894), that these names should be conserved, and that a replacement neotype for *U. capensis* should be designated from material of that species as currently understood.

The only species of *Upogebia* that has a gill associated with the fifth pereopod on the last thoracic somite is *africana*. That alone should establish the identity of this species and, in combination with other characters summarized by Ngoc-Ho & Poore, be entirely sufficient to distinguish it from *capensis*. USNM 105367 in the crustacean collection of the National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., is a group of 102 specimens of *U. africana* from Knysna, South Africa, collected by J.H.O. Day in January 1957. The gill on the last thoracic somite is clearly present on these specimens. Since Sakai's (1982) neotype of *capensis* is from Knysna there is a strong possibility that the specimen bears such a gill also and is therefore *africana*.